

REMARKS

A request for continued examination is being filed concurrently herewith. Claims 35 and 44 have been amended solely for clarity purposes. The Application contains claims 1-60. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications.

Claims 1-13, 37-41 and 46-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard (U.S. Patent no. 5,454,032), Bannister (U.S. Patent no. 5,548,636) or Mukerjee (U.S. Patent no. 6,405,041) in view of Giacopelli (U.S. Patent no. 6,324,410). The rejections are respectfully traversed .

Claim 1 recites a system for establishing telephone communication between a telephone call placed to a primary telephone number and at least one of a plurality of telephone devices, where the primary telephone number is associated with a primary telephone device. The system comprises a database for storing one or more other telephone numbers associated with the primary telephone number, means for detecting placement of the telephone call to the primary telephone number, means for retrieving at least one of the other telephone numbers from said database, means for placing a call to the at least one of the other telephone numbers and means for connecting the telephone call to the at least one of the plurality of telephone devices, if the first one of the plurality of telephone devices goes off hook before the primary telephone device goes off hook. According to claim 1, "said detecting means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the primary telephone number, said detecting means detecting the placement of the telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection."

Applicant respectfully submits that Pinard, Bannister and Mukerjee fail to disclose or suggest the claim 1 invention. Specifically, the cited references fail to


disclose or suggest “detecting means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the primary telephone number, said detecting means detecting the placement of the telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection.”<sup>1</sup> This fact is acknowledged by the Examiner at page 3 of the Office Action. To overcome this deficiency, the Office Action combines Pinard, Bannister and Mukerjee with Giacopelli. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Giacopelli is not prior art with respect to the present application and cannot be cited against the claimed invention for at least the following reasons.

The present application claims priority to, and incorporates by reference, provisional application no. 60/139,498, which was filed on June 14, 1999. Applicant has perfected the claim of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) by including a specific reference to provisional application no. 60/139,498 in the first paragraph of the present specification. In addition, as shown below in the following figures, 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 1, support for the claimed invention is found in provisional application no. 60/139,498. Specifically, provisional application no. 60/139,498 discloses and enables the “detecting means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the primary telephone number, said detecting means detecting the placement of the telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection.” This is illustrated below by the following figures and is explained in detail in the specification and exhibits of provisional application no. 60/139,498.

The first Figure below has been reproduced from provisional application no. 60/139,498 and clearly illustrates the “detecting means” and its physical connection to the physical extension associated with the primary telephone number. The Figure and supporting specification also illustrates the other claim limitations as well.


---

<sup>1</sup> Specific technical reasons supporting this argument were provided in the April 4, 2005 Amendment at pages 17-18, which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.



**Figure 1 of Provisional Application No. 60/139,498**

Figure 3 of the present application, reproduced below, is substantially the same as the above Figure (with some minor renumbering of the elements).



### **Figure 3 of the Present Application**

Accordingly, since Applicant has perfected a claim of priority to provisional application no. 60/139,498, which has 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph support for the claimed limitations, the effective filing date of the present application is June 14, 1999. The Giacopelli reference has a filing date of September 30, 1999, which is several months after the effective filing date of the present application. As such, Giacopelli cannot be used as prior art to show the claim 1 “detecting means.” *See* M.P.E.P. § 706.02(b).

Accordingly, none of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest the “detecting means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the primary telephone number, said detecting means detecting the placement of the telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection.” As such, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1.

Claim 9 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the primary telephone number” and an “engine retrieving the secondary telephone number from said database upon detecting the first telephone call by detecting activity on the associated physical connection, said engine placing a second call to the secondary telephone number and bridging the first telephone call to the secondary telephone device.” Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1 and on its own merits. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and are allowable along with claim 9.

Claim 37 recites “detecting placement of a telephone call to the primary telephone number by detecting activity on a physical connection to a telephone port associated with the primary telephone number.” Applicant respectfully submits that

claim 37 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1 and on its own merits. Claims 38-41 depend from claim 37 and are allowable along with claim 37.

Claim 46 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to a physical port associated with a first communication device” and “a memory, wherein a computer program is stored in said memory for execution by said processing unit to detect an attempt to initiate communications with the first communication device via said connection means.” Applicant respectfully submits that claim 46 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1 and on its own merits. Claims 47-60 depend from claim 46 and are allowable along with claim 46.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 14-36 and 42-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauger (U.S. Patent no. 5,537,610), Widergen (U.S. Patent no. 5,890,064), Eriksson (U.S. Patent no. 5,956,652) or Sjodin (U.S. Patent no. 5,995,843) in view of Giacopelli. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 recites an apparatus including “connection means comprising a physical connection to a physical extension associated with the landline telephone” and “a telephony engine coupled to said database and said connection means.” According to claim 14, “said engine receiving a telephone call, determining if the telephone call was received from the wireless telephone, retrieving telephone line connection information from said database corresponding to the landline telephone, and connecting the telephone call to a telephone line coupled to the landline telephone via said connection means on the basis of said telephone line connection information, the telephone call being connected to the telephone line such that the wireless telephone receives a dial tone.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Mauger, Widergen, Eriksson and Sjodin fail to disclose the limitations of claim 14. Specifically, Mauger, Widergen, Eriksson and Sjodin fail to disclose or teach tapping into a physical connection to a physical extension associated with a landline telephone. In addition, Mauger, Widergen, Eriksson and Sjodin fail to disclose connecting the telephone call to a telephone line coupled to the landline telephone via said connection means on the basis of telephone line connection information retrieved from a database. This fact is acknowledged by the Examiner at page 4 in the Office Action. To overcome this deficiency, the Office Action combines Mauger, Widergen, Eriksson and Sjodin with Giacopelli.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Giacopelli cannot be cited as prior art against the claimed invention for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. As such, claim 14 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and are allowable along with claim 14.

Claim 18 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to the telephone extension” and “a telephony engine coupled to said database and the enterprise network, said engine being adapted to determine if a telephone call was received from the wireless device and connects the device to the telephone extension via the connection means so that the wireless device receives a dial tone from the enterprise network and operates substantially identically as a telephone associated with and connected to the enterprise network via the telephone extension.” Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 18 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are allowable along with claim 18.

Claim 22 recites “connection means comprising a physical connection to the first telephone extension” and a “processor adapted to connect a first telephone call placed to the first telephone to the second telephone via the connection means based on

the connection information.” Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 22 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 23-27 depend from claim 22 and are allowable along with claim 22.

Claim 28 recites “detecting placement of the telephone call to the primary telephone number by detecting activity on a physical connection to a telephone port associated with the primary telephone number.” Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 28 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 29-32 depend from claim 28 and are allowable along with claim 28.

Claim 33 recites “connecting the wireless device to the telephone extension via a physical connection to the telephone extension so that the wireless device receives a dial tone from the enterprise network and operates substantially identically as a telephone associated with and connected to the enterprise network via the telephone extension.” Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 33 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 34-36 depend from claim 33 and are allowable along with claim 33.

Claim 42 recites “connecting the wireless device to the telephone extension via a physical analog connection to the extension so that the wireless device receives a dial tone from the enterprise network and operates substantially identically as a telephone associated with and connected to the enterprise network via the telephone extension.” Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above, claim 42 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 43-45 depend from claim 42 and are allowable along with claim 42.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
2101 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526  
(202) 785-9700  
Attorneys for Applicant